

UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE United States Patent and Trademark Office Address COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS FO Box 1430 Alexandra, Virginia 22313-1450 www.nepto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.	
10/626,142	07/24/2003	Paul A. Burgio	58359US003	9324	
32692 3M INNOVA	7590 09/02/200 FIVE PROPERTIES CO	EXAM	EXAMINER		
PO BOX 33427 ST. PAUL, MN 55133-3427			SUTTON, DARRYL C		
			ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER	
			1612		
			NOTIFICATION DATE	DELIVERY MODE	
			00/02/2009	EI ECTRONIC	

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

Notice of the Office communication was sent electronically on above-indicated "Notification Date" to the following e-mail address(es):

LegalUSDocketing@mmm.com LegalDocketing@mmm.com

Advisory Action Before the Filing of an Appeal Brief

Application No.		Applicant(s)	
10/626,142		BURGIO ET AL.	
	Examiner	Art Unit	
	DARRYL C. SUTTON	1612	

	DARRYL C. SUTTON	1612					
The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address							
THE REPLY FILED 06 August 2008 FAILS TO PLACE THIS A	PPLICATION IN CONDITION FOR	ALLOWANCE.					
 X The reply was filed after a final rejection, but prior to or or application, applicant must timely file one of the following application in condition for allowance; (2) a Notice of App for Continued Examination (RCE) in compliance with 37 periods: 	replies: (1) an amendment, affidavi eal (with appeal fee) in compliance	t, or other evidence, w with 37 CFR 41.31; or	hich places the (3) a Request				
	The period for reply expiresmonths from the mailing date of the final rejection.						
b) The period for reply expires on: (1) the mailing date of this A	e period for reply expires on: (i) the mailing date of this Advisory Action, or (2) the date set forth in the final rejection, whichever is later. In event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the mailing date of the final rejection.						
Examiner Note: If box 1 is checked, check either box (a) or MONTHS OF THE FINAL REJECTION. See MPEP 706.07	(b). ONLY CHECK BOX (b) WHEN THE						
Extensions of time may be obtained under 37 CFR 1.136(a). The dates have been filed is the date for purposes of determining the period of evaluated from: (1) the expiration date of the under 37 CFR 1.17(a) is calculated from: (1) the expiration date of the set forth in (b) above, if checked. Any reply received by the Office late may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).	tension and the corresponding amount shortened statutory period for reply origi than three months after the mailing dat	of the fee. The appropria nally set in the final Office	ate extension fee e action; or (2) as				
NOTICE OF APPEAL		The state of the state of the state of					
 The Notice of Appeal was filed on A brief in comp filing the Notice of Appeal (37 CFR 41.37(a)), or any extention Notice of Appeal has been filed, any reply must be filed with the companion of the Notice of Appeal has been filed, any reply must be filed with the companion of the Notice of Appeal has been filed, any reply must be filed with the notice of Appeal has been filed and the	nsion thereof (37 CFR 41.37(e)), to	avoid dismissal of the					
<u>AMENDMENTS</u>							
 The proposed amendment(s) filed after a final rejection, They raise new issues that would require further co They raise the issue of new matter (see NOTE beld 	nsideration and/or search (see NO		cause				
(c) They are not deemed to place the application in be appeal; and/or		lucing or simplifying to	ne issues for				
(d) ☐ They present additional claims without canceling a NOTE: (See 37 CFR 1.116 and 41.33(a)).		ected claims.					
The amendments are not in compliance with 37 CFR 1.1 Applicant's reply has overcome the following rejection(s)		mpliant Amendment (I	PTOL-324).				
 Applicant's lepty has overcome the billiowing rejection(s). Newly proposed or amended claim(s) would be allowable if submitted in a separate, timely filed amendment canceling the non-allowable claim(s). 							
7. For purposes of appeal, the proposed amendment(s): a) how the new or amended claims would be rejected is pro The status of the claim(s) is (or will be) as follows:		be entered and an e	xplanation of				
Claim(s) allowed: Claim(s) objected to:							
Claim(s) rejected: <u>1-3.5-17.19-25.27-32.34-43 and 45-80</u> Claim(s) withdrawn from consideration:							
AFFIDAVIT OR OTHER EVIDENCE 8. ☐ The affidavit or other evidence filed after a final action, but	thefere or on the date of filling a ble	tion of Annualill not	be entered				
 because applicant failed to provide a showing of good an was not earlier presented. See 37 CFR 1.116(e). 							
9. The affidavit or other evidence filed after the date of filing a Notice of Appeal, but prior to the date of filing a brief, will <u>not</u> be entered because the affidavit or other evidence failed to overcome <u>all</u> rejections under appeal and/or appellant fails to provide a showing a good and sufficient reasons why it is necessary and was not earlier presented. See 37 CFR 41.33(d)(1).							
10. The affidavit or other evidence is entered. An explanation REQUEST FOR RECONSIDERATION/OTHER	n of the status of the claims after er	ntry is below or attach	ed.				
 The request for reconsideration has been considered by <u>See Continuation Sheet.</u> 	t does NOT place the application in	condition for allowan	ce because:				
12. Note the attached Information <i>Disclosure Statement</i> (s). 13. Other:	(PTO/SB/08) Paper No(s)						
/Frederick Krass/							
Supervisory Patent Examiner, Art Unit 1612	/Darryl C Sutton/ Examiner, Art Unit 1612						

Continuation of 11, does NOT place the application in condition for allowance because: Applicant argues that Mitra et al. and Rozzi et al. do not meet the required limitation of having a second repeating unit that comprises a polarizable group which is different from the first repeating unit. The applicants argue that the second repeating unit clied by the examiner, "branched or cyclic alcohols" was in fact used to produce the repeating unit and is not a monomer on its own. The examiner agrees, but points to Mitra et al. which teaches that the monomer of Unit A is derived from mylic monomers such as acrylates, methacrylates, crotonates, itaconates and the like (column 3, lines 44-47). Unit B is derived from acrylate or methacrylate or "other" viryl polymerizable starting monomers, including styrene, winyl chloride, viryledne chloride, acrylylor monomers and the like (column 5, lines 10-20). Both unit A and unit B have several possible monomers which would produce different repeating groups, i.e. Unit A with an acrylate monomer and Unit B with a stryene monomer. The examiner also points to Rozzi et al, which teaches that the monomer of Unit A is derived from acrylate or methacrylates, methacrylates, crotonates, itaconates and the like (column 2, lines 64-66). Unit B is derived from acrylate or methacrylate or "other" viryl polymerizable starting monomers, including styrene, vinyl chloride, vinylidene chloride, acrylyd monomers and the like (column 4, lines 30-40). Both unit A and unit B have several possible monomers which would produce different repeating groups, i.e. Unit A with an acrylate monomer and Unit B with an acrylate monomer.